

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 50, Chapter 8 Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Grant

PIN	5542	COUNTY	Multiple Counties
APPLICANT	Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District	AMOUNT REQUESTED	\$499,940
PROJECT TITLE	Regional Integration of the Lower Tuscan Formation through Conjunctive Water	TOTAL PROJECT COST	\$666,970

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant is proposing to develop an IRWMP for the lands overlying the Lower Tuscan Formation aquifer system in the Sacramento Valley, including Butte County, Glenn County, and Colusa County to satisfy three objectives: Improve local water supply reliability, Improve Central Valley system-wide water supply reliability through participation in the emerging water transfer markets, and Enhance ecosystems in the rivers of the Sacramento Valley.

WORK PLAN - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has a detailed and specific work plan that adequately documents the proposal. Weighting factor is 3.

Score: 9

Comment: The proposal includes a work plan with detailed descriptions of activities and a project budget/schedule consistent with those activities. The project schedule shows completion by the end of 2007. Deliverables are not clear for some work items/activities. The budget is not supported with assumptions of estimated labor hours and the consultant hours are not broken down by type of professions. Activity 2 proposes to develop a stream flow monitoring program (stream geometry survey and stream gauge installation) on seven creeks but appears to be under budgeted at only \$12,000. The applicant provides a footnote for this activity, which states that DWR, Northern District, is interested in doing this activity, subject to available resources. It is not understood from this footnote how the applicant will fund this activity.

DESCRIPTION OF REGION - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented a detailed and specific description that adequately documents the region. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 3

Comment: The applicant has described the boundaries of the agencies involved in the proposed IRWMP and also discussed the region as overlying the Lower Tuscan Groundwater Formation within the Counties of Butte, Glenn, Colusa, and Tehama. The region is also defined as including riparian lands along the Feather and Sacramento Rivers. However, the two maps included in the application do not indicate the spatial extent of the Lower Tuscan Groundwater Formation; both in the exposed eastern parts of the region nor in the confined parts. The proposal also does not include the vertical extent of the aquifer nor wells currently pumping from it, nor does it mention internal boundaries. Additionally, a more thorough description of water related infrastructure is needed. Current CVP and SWP conveyance systems are also not shown in relation to the defined region.

OBJECTIVES - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific planning objectives. Weighting factor is 2.

Score: 6

Comment: The application includes clearly stated objectives of local and State water supply reliability as well as environmental improvements in the Sacramento Valley. These objectives are part of efforts by Sacramento Valley agencies to put together regional plans that implement conjunctive water management and water transfer programs without adversely affecting local water supply reliability. Most statewide priorities are included in the IRWMP, but there is no mention of TMDLs or SWRCB's NPS Pollution Plan. More description on the planning process to include specific interests of other stakeholders is needed. The section on sensitive species was weak, the applicant states that it will improve habitat and spawning conditions for Coho Salmon, but there are no Coho Salmon in the Sacramento River Watershed.

INTEGRATION OF WATER MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented how water management strategies will be integrated. Weighting factor is 2.

Score: 6

Comment: The applicant identifies various scenarios which would consider several water management strategies. The main strategies are water transfers, groundwater management, water supply reliability, and conjunctive use. Scenarios which involve reservoir re-operation have components of flood management and environmental restoration. The proposal does not include consideration of water quality and water recycling as well as stormwater capture strategies.

IMPLEMENTATION - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately detailed plan implementation. Weighting factor is 2.

Score: 6

Comment: The proposal discusses the development of the IRWMP and its adoption. It also mentions that a legal framework would be created to allow the implementation of the adopted IRWMP; however, the application does not include details on IRWMP implementation. Furthermore, a schedule of implementation beyond IRWMP adoption could not be found nor was there any discussion on how performance would be monitored.

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 50, Chapter 8 Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Grant

IMPACTS AND BENEFITS - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately presented and documented the impacts and benefits of the Plan. Weighting factor is 2.

Score: 8

Comment: Three main benefits of the proposed planning effort and several secondary benefits are listed and discussed in various sections of the application. Risks and impacts associated with the IRWMP are elaborately discussed as well as strategies to manage them. However, the applicant also indicates that there will likely be unknown impacts from implementing the IRWMP. The applicant states that IRWMP implementation would be exempt from CEQA/NEPA compliance due to positive impacts to the environment and will not require an EIR/EIS. However, this appears to be a premature assessment without supporting verification.

DATA AND TECHNICAL ANALYSIS - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific data and technical analysis components of the proposal. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 3

Comment: Completed and on-going technical investigations are presented. The IRWMP would rely on existing and new data collected from those activities. Data types are stated, but the volume of specific data is not provided. Technical studies are listed and described. Specific data and technical analysis components of the proposal are lacking. More discussion of the planned technical studies and data gaps is needed to clarify the need for the studies.

DATA MANAGEMENT - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific data management procedures. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 3

Comment: The applicant states that a DMS will be established to facilitate data sharing and archiving. The process for establishing a DMS is not stated in detail. The need for local and statewide data management is discussed as well. Details are not provided on how proposed scenarios and modeling efforts would make use of collected and analyzed data. The application does not provide much detail on actual management of data; it appears to be mostly a reiteration of DWR Bulletin 160. The applicant acknowledges the need for data management, but there is insufficient discussion on how data management procedures will be used.

STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented stakeholder involvement concerns. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 3

Comment: The work plan includes holding a series of workshops to bring together stakeholders that are identified as having varying degrees of interest in the IRWMP. Developments of water management scenarios, selection of scenarios for the IRWMP, and setting up institutional arrangement for IRWMP implementation are tasks that potential stakeholders would do. One of the local agencies listed as having indicated strong interest has submitted a letter indicating that it would not participate in the proposal. This brings into question the level of stakeholder involvement and support. Though it is stated that additional stakeholders not initially identified will be incorporated into the process, it is not stated how additional stakeholders will be identified. Shasta County is not included as stakeholder, yet the region extends into Shasta County and the IRWMP includes the conveyance of reallocated water from Shasta Dam.

DISADVANTAGE COMMUNITIES - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented disadvantaged community concerns. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 3

Comment: The applicant states that the region, as a whole, qualifies as a DAC. The water supply and water quality needs of the region are described. Increased revenue from water transfers, improved region-wide water supply reliability, etc. are not necessarily DAC targeted/direct benefits. The applicant states that representatives of DACs will be invited to participate in the planning process.

RELATION TO LOCAL PLANNING - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented the Plan's relationship to local planning efforts. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 5

Comment: Several local water management plans and county ordinances have been identified for coordination under the IRWMP. There is some discussion, though scarce, on how local and regional planning would be coordinated to avoid redundancy. Dynamics and relation between the IRWMP and local agency planning documents are described.

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 50, Chapter 8 Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Grant

AGENCY COORDINATION - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented agency coordination issues. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 3

Comment: The applicant states that there would be coordination with State and federal agencies responsible for operation of SWP and CVP, as well as local water suppliers. Although the applicant states that coordination is needed for success, it does not describe any tools or incentives to achieve that end and details on degrees and level of cooperation are not provided. There are some inconsistencies in statements regarding the coordination with DWR. The applicant states that consultative workshops during the planning process would facilitate the coordination, though the role of various agencies is not described. The applicant acknowledges that they are part of the region covered by PIN 4764, but states that they are nested within that region to provide a more focused, locally driven IRWMP.

TOTAL SCORE: 58